

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Utah Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

This worksheet is to be completed consistent with guidance provided in instructional text boxes on the worksheet and the 'Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet' located at the end of the worksheet. The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision; however, it constitutes an administrative record to be provided as evidence in protest, appeals and legal procedures.

A. BLM Office: Cedar City Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No. DOI-BLM-UT-C010-2015-0002-DNA

Proposed Action Title/Type:

Transfer the grazing preference and grazing permit for the North Creek Allotment to Cody William Wright (c/o William D. Wright) (Case File No. 4304778) from Alan Green (Case File No. 4304375).

The Proposed Action would also provide for the issuance of a ten year grazing permit within the North Creek Allotment. The Alan Green (Case File No. 4304375) grazing permit would be terminated.

Location of Proposed Action:

The North Creek Allotment is located approximately 2 miles from Beaver, UT. (Refer to the Attached Map).

Description of the Proposed Action:

The grazing preference (51 AUMs) is being transferred from base property owned by Alan Green (Case File No. 4304375) to base property that is owned by Cody William Wright (c/o William D. Wright) (Case File No. 4304778). The Proposed Action would authorize the transfer of livestock grazing preference to Cody William Wright (c/o William D. Wright) and the issuance of a ten year grazing permit within the North Creek Allotment. The Alan Green (Case File No. 4304375) grazing permit would be terminated. No changes will be made to the Terms and Conditions of the grazing permit at this time.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

☒ Yes

☐ No

An Environmental Assessment (EA-UT-040-09-17) was prepared to analyze the effects of grazing management practices within the North Creek Allotment. Following the analysis, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Grazing Permit Renewal Proposed Decision for the North Creek Allotment was issued to the interested public. The Proposed Decision was issued for the 15-day protest and 30-day appeal period and became final on May 15, 2010. No changes are proposed from that action.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

☒ Yes

☐ No

The North Creek Allotment grazing permit renewal was posted on the Environmental Notification Bulletin Board in 2008 to solicit alternative development input from the public. In addition, a scoping letter was issued to the interested publics on January 8, 2009 requesting information and alternatives for the management of the North Creek Allotment. Information and alternatives that were received were fully considered and incorporated. It was determined that a reasonable range of alternatives were analyzed in EA-UT-040-09-17.

Yes. The North Creek Allotment Permit Renewal (EA-UT-040-09-17) addressed the direct and indirect impacts to other resources based on the continuance of grazing within the allotments. No other direct or indirect impacts have been identified at this time.

6. Are the reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Yes. The cumulative impacts analyzed in the North Creek Allotment (EA-UT-040-09-17) are the same as this action. No other cumulative impacts have been identified at this time.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Yes. The previous action was posted on the ENBB in 2008. The ENBB was continuously updated throughout the permit renewal process. In addition, a scoping letter was sent out to the interested public on January 8, 2009, requesting additional information and alternatives that could be addressed in the Environmental Assessment.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting analysis or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

NAME	TITLE	RESOURCE REPRESENTED
Dan Fletcher	Assistant Field Manager	Livestock Grazing, Vegetation, Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines, Socio-Economic, Environmental Justice
Craig Egerton	Natural Resource Specialist	Air, Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds, Farmlands, Floodplains, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hydrology, Soils, Woodland/Forestry, NEPA Review, Water
Adam Stephens	Rangeland Management Specialist	Wetlands/Riparian Zones
Sheri Whitfield	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, TECS, Migratory Birds
Ed Ginouves	Mining Engineer	Minerals, Paleontology
Nathan Thomas	Archeologist	Cultural, Native American Religious Concerns
Brandon Johnson	Realty Specialist	Lands
Dave Jacobson	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, Wilderness, Visual, ACEC, Wild and Scenic Rivers

2. Grazing fees must be paid in full prior to livestock turnout. Actual use information must be reported within 15 days following the completion of the grazing season.
3. Failure to pay the grazing bill within 15 days of the due date specified in the bill would result in a late fee assessment of \$25 or 10 percent of the bill, whichever is greater, but not to exceed \$250. Payment made later than 15 days after the due date, would include the appropriate late fee assessment. Failure to make payment within 30 days may be a violation of 4140.1(b) (1) and would result in action by the authorized officer under 4150.1 and 4160.1-2.
4. Livestock grazing use would be managed in accordance with the Utah Guidelines for Grazing Management. This permit, including the terms and conditions, may be modified if additional information indicates that revision is necessary in order to conform with the Utah Standards for Rangeland Health, the Fundamentals of Rangeland Health and Regulations at Title 43 CFR 4100.
5. Maintenance of all structural range projects are a responsibility of the permittees. Maintenance would be in accordance with the approved cooperative agreements for range improvements (Form 4120-6) or range improvement permit (Form 4120-7). Failure to maintain assigned projects in satisfactory condition constitutes a violation in accordance with Title 43 CFR 4140.1 (a) (4) and may result in the suspension of your license until maintenance is completed.
6. All salt/mineral supplements would be located at least ¼ mile or further distance from any riparian area, wet meadow or watering facility (either permanent or temporary) unless stipulated through a written agreement or decision.
7. Supplemental feeding of roughage is prohibited on public lands unless emergency conditions exist, then only by written permission from the authorized officer [Title 43 CFR 4140.1 (a) (3)].
8. Movement to the next scheduled pasture or off of the allotment would occur on the specified dates, when unusual climatic conditions dictate a move or when the utilization objective is met. The permittee would be allowed 3-5 days flexibility to move livestock.
9. All exclosures on public land throughout the allotment(s) would be closed to livestock grazing unless grazing use is applied for by the permittee and is authorized in writing by the authorized officer.
10. All grazing permittees would provide reasonable access across private and/or leased lands to the BLM for the orderly management and protection of the public lands.

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST

Project Title: North Creek Allotment Livestock Grazing Permit transfer from Alan Green to Cody William Wright (c/o William D. Wright)

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-C010-2015-0002-DNA

File/Serial Number:

Project Leader: Dan Fletcher

DETERMINATION OF STAFF: (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

Determi- nation	Resource	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NC	Air Quality	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) is adequate	C. Egerton	10/10/14
NP	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	None present within the field office.	D. Jacobson	10-24-2014
NC	Cultural Resources	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) is adequate	J. Palmer	10/20/14
NI	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions were not analyzed in the original EA. GHG's created by this livestock operation would continue at current rates and are inconsequential in relation to local and regional emissions.	C. Egerton	10/10/14
NC	Environmental Justice	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) adequate	D. Fletcher	10/10/14
NC	Farmlands (Prime or Unique)	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) is adequate	C. Egerton	10/10/14
NC	Fish and Wildlife Excluding USFW Designated Species	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) adequate.	S. Whitfield	10/14/14
NC	Floodplains	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) is adequate	C. Egerton	10/10/14
NC	Fuels/Fire Management	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) is adequate	S Peterson	10/14/14
NC	Geology / Mineral Resources/Energy Production	The previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) is adequate	E. Ginouves	10/14/14
NI	Hydrologic Conditions	Was not analyzed specifically in the original analysis, but hydrologic conditions would have been considered under soils.	C. Egerton	10/10/14

NC	Vegetation Excluding USFW Designated Species	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) adequate	D. Fletcher <i>D4</i>	10/14/14
NC	Visual Resources	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) is adequate	D. Jacobson <i>D</i>	10/14/14
NC	Wild Horses and Burros	Previous analysis (EA-040-09-017) is adequate.	C. Hunter <i>CH</i>	<i>10/24/14</i>
NP	Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	The 2011 Wilderness Characteristics Inventory indicates unit UT-C010-132 does not have wilderness characteristics	D. Jacobson <i>D</i>	10-24-2014

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
Environmental Coordinator	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>10/27/14</i>	
Authorized Officer	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>10/27/14</i>	